M	es	sa	ø	e
1 V I	CJ	эu	5	v.

From: D'Amico, Louis [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=78A91F83C4414910BE286EFE02004DBC-D'AMICO, LOUIS J.]

Sent: 2/20/2018 10:51:55 PM

To: Bahadori, Tina [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=7da7967dcafb4c5bbc39c666fee31ec3-Bahadori, Tina]

Subject: FW: Senate EPW Oversight Hearing Questions for the Record

Additional QFR

(NOTE NEW CONTACT

INFORMATION)

Louis D'Amico, Ph.D.

Assistant Center Director, Communications and Regulatory Support - National Center for Environmental Assessment Associate Director for Policy and Communications - Human Health Risk Assessment National Research Program U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development

damico.louis@epa.gov

O: (202) 564-4605 M: [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

From: D'Amico, Louis

Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 2:53 PM

To: Linkins, Samantha < Linkins. Samantha@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Senate EPW Oversight Hearing Questions for the Record

I missed the hearing, but would bet that one is supposed to be ours.

Talking to Tina about how to respond to these later today.

(NOTE NEW CONTACT

INFORMATION)

Louis D'Amico, Ph.D.

Assistant Center Director, Communications and Regulatory Support - National Center for Environmental Assessment Associate Director for Policy and Communications - Human Health Risk Assessment National Research Program U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development

damico.louis@epa.gov

O: (202) 564-4605 M Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Linkins, Samantha

Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 2:36 PM
To: D'Amico, Louis DAmico,Louis@epa.gov

Subject: RE: Senate EPW Oversight Hearing Questions for the Record

FYI there's also this one, which was assigned to but should it be ours?

79. Extraordise Process [During the hearing, you committed to updating my office on the status of the formaldehyde health assessment, which I understand has been completed by EPA staff but not yet released.

- a. What date was the draft assessment completed by EPA staff?
- b. What is the exact timeline for public release?
- c. What are the exact steps that EPA must take internally before the report is shared for interagency review?

Samantha Linkins
Science Communication Specialist and Congressional Lead
Office of Research and Development, US EPA
Washington, DC

Office: 202-564-1834
Cell: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Bahadori, Tina

Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 5:01 PM

To: Linkins, Samantha < Linkins. Samantha@epa.gov >; D'Amico, Louis < DAmico. Louis@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: Senate EPW Oversight Hearing Questions for the Record

Sure Sam, we will.

Thanks, Tina

From: Linkins, Samantha

Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 4:44 PM

To: D'Amico, Louis <<u>DAmico, Louis@epa.gov</u>>; Bahadori, Tina <<u>Bahadori, Tina@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: Fwd: Senate EPW Oversight Hearing Questions for the Record

Hey Lou and Tina,

We just got the QFRs from the Administrator's EPW hearing. Most of ORD's questions are about IRIS, of course. I've pasted them below. Could you help draft some answers please? I'd like to get these up for IOAA review next Wednesday, if possible, or Thursday morning.

EPA's February 1, 2018 Report to Congress on the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) states that EPA has already contracted with the National Academy of Sciences for peer review of the formaldehyde human health assessment.

- a. I have been informed that the human health assessment for formaldehyde was completed by IRIS staff months ago. Is that accurate?
- b. If so, why has the health assessment not yet been released i) for intra-agency review, ii) inter-agency peer review, iii) for public comment and iv) to theNAS for peer review, and when will each such step occur?
- c. If not, please describe precisely what work remains to be completed before each step described above can occur, along with time estimates for each step.
- d. Please provide me with an un-redacted copy of the current draft of the IRIS human health assessment for formaldehyde.

11. From January 20, 2017 until the present, please provide information regarding all meetings (including conference calls) related to the formaldehyde human health assessment, including the date, attendee names (and for non-EPA employees, their affiliations) and copies of any materials prepared for or obtained from each such meeting. Please also provide the same information for meetings EPA staff may have attended related to formaldehyde more generally.

12 The Report to Congress states that the IRIS staff have operationalized the "systematic review" process used to determine which and how scientific studies can be relied upon to inform IRIS assessments.

- a. Please provide me with a copy of the document that captures these revisions.
- b. OCSPP: Please additionally provide a copy of the document that describes the EPA Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention "fit for purpose" systematic review process that is referenced on page 19 of

the December 12, 2017 EPA document entitled "Revised Glyphosate Issue Paper: Evaluation of Carcinogenic Potential."

Please describe the timeline and full scope of the NAS review of the IRIS program described in the Report to Congress. Will the IRIS program's new "systematic review" process be included in the scope, and if not, why not?

The Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) provides the scientific research needed to effectively implement the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Food Quality Protection Act, and the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), among other laws that protect our nation's public health and environment. However, there have been repeated attacks made on IRIS's objectivity and independence, despite recent changes made to strengthen its scientific approach. There are reportedly around 30 people left working at IRIS, after a period of serious attrition similar to that seen within other EPA offices.

- a. Does the EPA plan on moving the IRIS program from the Office of Research and Development to the Office of Chemical Safety Pollution and Prevention (OCSPP) as reported, thereby placing it within the regulatory arm of the EPA and out of the science and research office?
- b. If yes, please detail how the EPA would ensure that the scientific research remains independent, transparent, and non-politicized.
- c. Please provide a list of dates and attendees of meetings you or senior political appointees have taken in which IRIS was discussed, as well as any communication or documents relating to these meetings.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Moody, Christina" < Moody. Christina@epa.gov>

Date: February 16, 2018 at 1:54:55 PM EST

To: "Grantham, Nancy" < Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov >, "Grogard, Megan" < Grogard.Megan@epa.gov >, "Jones-Parra, Lisa" < Jones-Parra, Lisa@epa.gov >, "Feeley, Drew (Robert)" < Feeley.Drew@epa.gov >, "Kime, Robin" < Kime.Robin@epa.gov >, "Mills, Derek" < Mills, Derek@epa.gov >, "Linkins, Samantha" < Linkins.Samantha@epa.gov >, "Jones-Peeler, Meshell" < Jones-Peeler.Meshell@epa.gov >, "Kelty, Diane" < Kelty.Diane@epa.gov >

Subject: Senate EPW Oversight Hearing Questions for the Record

All:

Heads up on questions for the record from the Jan 30 Senate EPW hearing with Administrator Pruitt. Attached is the full set of QFRs. Each of your programs has been identified in the attached document.

Please take a look at the entire set to see if I missed any and if any need redirecting to or from your respective programs. Where there are two or more programs listed, the first program should take the lead in drafting the response, and work in coordination with the second and/or third programs listed to provide input.

These are on a tight turnaround; the draft responses are due to OCIR by Weds, Feb 28. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Congressional Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations Moody.Christina@epa.gov